

REMARKS

These remarks and the accompanying amendments are responsive to the final Office Action mailed January 9, 2004 (hereinafter referred to simply as "the Office Action"). Entry of the accompanying amendments and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested in light of the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed herewith.

Claim 1-30 were pending at the time of the last examination. The Office Action rejected all of the then pending claims. Specifically, Claims 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by United States patent number 5,442,633 issued to Perkins et al. (hereinafter referred to simply as "Perkins"). Furthermore, Claims 1-9, 11-20 and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States patent number 6,215,790 issued to Voit et al. (hereinafter referred to simply as "Voit"). Lastly, Claims 10 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins in view of Voit and further in view of the admitted prior art.

Page 2, lines 16-22 of the Office Action states as follows:

Applicants also argue on page 11 of Remarks: 'In Perkins et al., the IP address of the MH 10 does not include the location address recited in the claims. Specifically, the IP address of Perkins is not an address which identifies an access link termination node for which a user has carried out location registration.'

Examiner disagrees because in Perkins et al., the IP address includes the location address identifying an access link termination node for which a user has carried out location registration (please refer back to the reference).

In response to this statement, we reviewed Perkins in detail once again, and once again come to the opposite conclusion as stated in the Office Action for the reasons that will now be expressed in detail.

Page 6, lines 1-3 of the Office Action states as follows:

However, Perkins et al disclose the IP address including the location address which identifies an access link termination node for which the user has carried out location registration and a user identifier identifies the user (see col.5, lines 7-17); . . .

Thus, we reviewed in particular Col. 5, lines 7-17 of Perkins (hereinafter referred to as "the Perkins passage") since this is the passage that the Office Action relies on for the contested assertion that Perkins discloses an IP address including the location address which identifies an access link terminal node for which the user has carried out location registration and a user identified that identifies the user. The Perkins passages states as follows in its entirety:

An IP address consists of four bytes, or 32 bits, that are partitioned into a LAN identification and a Host identification. By example, an IP address may have the form 123.45.67.12. In the absence of a subnet mask, the first one, two, or three bytes encode a LAN address. For example, the LAN address may be encoded as 123 (byte 1) and 45 (byte 2). The remaining bits generally encode Host address information. In the example provided Host (12) may have up to 64K IP addresses associated therewith, as encoded in the third and fourth bytes.

Here, "Host" means a base access station (BAS) 12, not a mobile host (MH) 10. The Perkins passage makes it clear that there is a term "Host (12)". Further, if an IP address of the mobile host 10 consists of the LAN identification and the Host identification, the LAN identification has to be changed each time the mobile host 10 moves to another LAN. If so, it contradicts the following description in Col. 5, lines 18-22 of Perkins:

It is assumed in the ensuing description that each MH 10 has a Network Layer Address (IP address or an NSAP). This address is referred to as a "permanent address" that does not change as the MH 10 migrates between Level 2 subnetworks."

Therefore, the IP address of the mobile host 10 does not consist of the LAN identification and the Host identification. Therefore, the IP address does not include a location address, much

less a location address which identifies an access link termination node for which (a user of) the mobile host 10 has carried out location registration.

Therefore, Perkins does not describe, teach or suggest "an IP address of the user in the mobile communications network system including a location address which identifies an access link termination node for which the user has carried out location registration and a user identifier which identifies the user" as recited in independent Claims 1, 11, 22, 26, 28. Furthermore, Perkins does not describe, teach or suggest "an IP address of the user in the mobile communications network system including a location address of the user and a user identifier which identifies the user" as recited in independent Claims 27, 29. In addition, Perkins does not describe, teach or suggest "an IP address of the user including the location address of the access link termination node and a user identifier which identifies the user" as recited in independent Claim 30. Likewise, neither Voit nor the admitted prior art includes these recited features. Accordingly, Claims 1, 11, 22 and 30 are neither anticipated nor rendered unpatentable over Perkins, Voit, and the admitted prior art, either singly or in combination. Likewise, Claims 2-10, 20, 25 and 31-32 are not anticipate nor rendered unpatentable over Perkins, Voit, and the admitted prior art based at least for the same reasons provided for their corresponding independent claim. Therefore, withdrawal of each of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 31 and 32 are newly added claims dependent claims. As recited in Claim 31, the processing method of Claim 27 further comprises 1) referring to a memory managing access link establishment status of a user in the domain-name server, when an inquiry regarding the user is sent to the domain-name server, 2) commanding an access link termination node in whose area the user is visiting, to establish an access link, if an access link is not established for the user, 3) establishes, at the access link termination node, an access link between the access link

termination node and the user, and 4) provides, at the access link termination node, the user with the location address, when the access link is established.

Perkins and Voit do not disclose these recited features. Voit only discloses that, when an inquiry is sent to the domain-name server, whether or not the primary destination terminal is "live" is determined. If the primary destination terminal is "live", the IP address of the primary destination terminal is output, and if the primary destination terminal is not "live", the IP address of the alternate destination terminal is output (see Voit, Col. 16, line 37 to column 18, line 29 and Figure 3). Therefore, Claim 31 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious over Perkins, Voit and the admitted prior art (either singly or in combination) for at least this additional reason as well.

Claim 32 depends from Claim 31, and is thus also not anticipated nor rendered obvious over Perkins, Voit and the admitted prior art (either singly or in combination) for the same reason as provided for Claim 31. Further, Perkins and Voit do not disclose "a flag indicating access link establishment is set in the memory managing access link establishment status, when the access link is established and the IP address is newly registered" as recited in Claim 32. Therefore, Claim 32 is also patentable for this additional reason as well.

Claim 33 is a newly added claim. As recited in Claim 33, a terminal carries out location registration for an access link termination node, and receives a location address of the access link termination node from the access link termination node. Then, the terminal sets an IP address including the location address, and a user identifier of a user of the terminal, as a calling address of a packet, and transmits the packet. Perkins and Voit do not disclose these features. Therefore, Claim 33 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Perkins and Voit, either singly or in combination.

Claim 34 is a newly added claim. As recited in Claim 34, a terminal transmits a domain name of a user to a domain-name server, and receives an IP address including a location address of the user, and a user identifier of the user, from the domain-name server. Then, the terminal sets the IP address as a called address of a packet, and transmits the packet. Perkins and Voit likewise do not disclose these features. In Perkins, when a packet is transmitted to a mobile host (MH) 10, the address of the MR 20, or the address of the BAS 12 that is presently serving the MH10 is set as the destination address (see column 7, lines 47-61 and column 8, lines 28-37). Therefore, Claim 34 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious over Perkins and Voit, either singly or in combination.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,



ADRIAN J. LEE
Registration No. 42,785
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 022913

AJL:ds
DS0000001893V001